

MEETING SUMMARY
FOREST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING (FMAC)
Michigan United Conservation Club
2101 Wood Street, Lansing, MI
Wednesday, May 2, 2007
1 p.m.

FMAC Members Present

Mr. William (Bill) Bobier, Earthscape Resource Management
Ms. Lynne Boyd, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Forest, Mineral and Fire Management (FMFM)
Dr. Margaret (Peg) Gale, Michigan Technological University
Dr. Dan Keathley, Michigan State University
Mr. Frank Ruswick, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Mr. Warren Suchovsky, Suchovsky Logging
Ms. Erin McDonough, Michigan United Conservation Clubs, for Ms. Donna Stine

FMAC Members Absent

Mr. William Cook, Michigan State University Extension
Mr. Desmond Jones, Michigan Tree Farm System
Mr. William Manson, Michigan Snowmobile Association
Mr. Gordon Wenk, MDA
Ms. Anne Woiwode, Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter
Mr. Joel Blohm, Great Northern Lumber of Michigan
Mr. Thomas Dunn, American Motorcycle Association
Ms. Susan Holben, Michigan Economic Development Corporation

FMAC Committee Advisors Present

Ms. Leanne Marten, USDA Forest Service

Public Attendees/Guests

Mr. George Berghorn, Michigan Forest Products Council
Mr. Chris Risbrudt, USFS, Forest Products Laboratory, Wisconsin
Mr. Mike Stimak, USFS
Mr. Jerry Bird, USFS
Ms. Shannon Rische, USFS

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Staff Present

Ms. Kerry Gray, FMFM
Mr. David Price, FMFM
Ms. Kim Korbecki, FMFM

Lynne Boyd called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Lynne Boyd provided an overview of the agenda; moved "VI – Application of Management Areas in the Ecoregional Planning Process" to the end of the agenda.

MOTION: **Warren Suchovsky** moved to adopt the meeting agenda; supported by **Dan Keathley**. Motion carried.

ADOPTION OF MEETING SUMMARY

MOTION: **Warren Suchovsky** moved to adopt the Wednesday, March 7, 2007 meeting summary; supported by **Frank Ruswick**. Motion carried.

USDA Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory Presentation

Chris Risbrudt, PhD., Director

Dr. Risbrudt provided a power-point presentation which started with the history of forestry as it relates to forest products, and went on to show products currently being made and researched at his lab. He discussed wood anatomy research, economics, energy and biomass, engineered bio-composites, moisture and durability in buildings, nanotechnology, pulp and paper, small-diameter timber, and wood adhesives. He reported the United States produces a greater volume of wood as a material than any other country, and stated wood naturally recycles carbon. He gave examples of wood created in the lab and talked about engineered bio-composites, and an area where they used this material with latex binders to make portions of playgrounds A.D.A. accessible.

Dr. Risbrudt discussed how the lab experimented with water filters for extracting phosphates, pesticides, and fertilizers out of water. He reported Cedar bark is good for extractives; it assists in taking pollution out of water.

The lab has been working with energy and biomass, currently using a 35 kilowatt unit, dumping wood chips to create a source of energy. They are currently working on a 1 megawatt unit in the expectation these units could be placed in the woods and money would be saved on hauling wood out to chippers.

Biomass as feedstock for a bio-energy and bio-products industry was discussed with a reported 1.3 billion bio-mass per year. The "Agenda 2020" focus for the future includes forest Bio-refinery; forest products have not earned its cost in capital, and the United States has difficulty competing with other countries due to growth time and salary scales.

Nanotechnology was discussed including solid state technology; bio-technology, and nanotechnology. **Dr. Risbrudt** explained wood contains cellulose nanofibers; he stated that revenue is approximately \$5 billion per year to make paper, but converted it can have higher value materials and can earn \$5.5 billion in chemicals and energy. Nanofibers have a fraction of the strength of carbon nanotubes, which produce lighter weight, higher strength paper. The lab has also incorporated nanosensors to see parasites, therefore avoiding contaminated wood.

Discussion continued regarding the benefits of wood versus crops to produce cellulose, and the competition that crops present. **Ms. Marten** stated the Forest Products Laboratory is a great place to visit to see the latest technology, and how that technology is being put to use.

A copy of **Dr. Risbrudt's** presentation can be found on the FMAC web page under the heading "Resources".

Public Comment

None

Discussion of Revenue Adjustments

Peg Gale opened with stating she had talked with Warren Suchovsky and Dan Keathley at other meetings, and they agree the Committee may not all be moving in the same direction. She suggested reviewing the document "Discussions on Revenue Adjustments, etc. for the DNR" as a working document, and to review concerns in each category. **Dr. Gale** questioned if the document could be used to present to Legislature to show limitations and to assist the DNR.

Dr. Keathley commented on his concerns as he observes what is currently happening. He stated the need to get legislature to understand the state has tremendous resources that enriches lives and assists the economy. The legislature also should recognize investing in the resource base has the same payoff as other areas. He recommended working on a way to convince legislators that it will pay-off and bring monetary jobs to the state.

Dr. Gale commented the DNR seems to present our case to the legislature often, but for some reason they are not getting the message. **Mr. Bobier** said it is not just forestry, but conservation as a whole the legislature and society does not understand. **Ms. Boyd** stated perhaps the problem is that we are not tying the issues back locally enough, i.e., pointing out the benefits to each individual district. **George Berghorn** commented that even meeting with legislators and presenting the benefits to their districts still only has a 50/50 chance of working; discussions with them need to be addressed in specifics to keep them on point.

Ms. Marten asked how the Natural Resources Commission fits into this issue. **Ms. Boyd** responded the NRC sets policy for the Department; the Department is responsible for carrying out policy, and specific decisions often are under the Director's authority.

Dr. Keathley asked if Larry Pedersen could put together a publication of the scope of wood economy; take the main sectors of the economy and bring it back to the specifics of forest management.

The FMAC committee discussed and made changes to the "Discussion of Revenue Adjustment" handout that Dr. Gale provided for the meeting.

Dr. Gale stated she would edit the "Discussion of Revenues" sheet to reflect the conversation and would come up with "action" items for the Committee for next meeting.

Ms. Boyd suggested continuing to use the chart Ms. Gale had provided, bring issue lists to the next meeting, and look at cost revenue spending. She would like the Committee to focus on those areas they feel will help most.

Ms. Boyd stated she would like the Committee to take the initiative to pick the biggest issue from the "Top Issues" list that they feel they can make progress with. The Committee has not had any accomplishments since completing the Right to Forest Gamps.

Application of management areas in the ecoregional planning process

Mr. Dave Price, Forest, Mineral and Fire Management, DNR

Ms. Boyd introduced Mr. Dave Price (DNR- FMFM). She asked Mr. Price to present before the Committee an update on the Ecoregional Plan. She indicated the Eco Teams had started over and are looking at ways to provide more specific direction, and Mr. Price would explain the procedures the DNR are considering. She stated the presentation had been given at Statewide Council (SWC) already, and she wanted it presented to FMAC to request insight from the Committee members.

Mr. Price began by reporting they are currently preparing for a certification audit and adjusting the structure of the ecoregional plan. The objective is to provide integrated, strategic level direction that will improve tactical decision-making at the Management Unit level of operations.

He commented on the method of addressing Corrective Action Response (CAR) areas. He stated the DNR uses a similar concept as the Forest Service; Parks and Recreation currently use a

management zone concept, based on the National Park method. Certain criteria are needed to be able to use a management area zone:

- Areas with existing and specific management purposes (i.e. the Pigeon River Country);
- Concentrations of similar landforms or site potentials;
- Concentrations of similar cover type or successional states;
- Concentrated area of ownership (i.e. blocks of un-fragmented forest);
- Size (emphasizing a landscape space with a minimum of 15-20 compartments);
- Proximity to forest product markets;
- Watershed boundaries

Mr. Price stated the DNR has separated and recognized special management needs. He identified the following as sub-areas within the management zone:

- Special Conservation Areas (SCAs); grouping of areas within a landscape
- High Conservation Value Areas (HCVAs); related to high conservation, like forest certification, legal dedication, or already singled out for special management. Examples are critical habitat; dedicated management; critical dunes; and natural rivers
- Ecological Reference Areas (ERAs)

Mr. Price stated the DNR is looking for the Committee's perspective on this topic.

Ms. Marten commented the National Forest Plans have had management areas for years, based on ecological land types. She suggested the need to work together to minimize the confusion for the public.

Ms. Gale agreed the FMAC and DNR should continue working together, starting with the ecoregions as a base, then breaking it down from there.

Mr. Bobier stated the Committee now has the ability to look at the land we have and figure out a better way to manage it, but needs to think about boundary lines and ways to manage it without conflict.

Mr. Price indicated the DNR would be appreciative in any perspective FMAC can provide, especially in the area of "options for further developing such a concept with involvement".

Ms. Marten told Mr. Price he could use her as a contact person, and she would have a staff person get in contact with him.

NEXT MEETING

TUESDAY*, June 12, 2007

*Please note different meeting day
Michigan United Conservation Clubs
2101 Wood Street, Lansing
1:00-4:00 p.m.

Wednesday, July 11, 2007

Location to be determined

Agenda Items:

DNR Ecoregional Plan (Dave Price – FMFM)

Conservation District Forest Presentation

Recognition Policy

SWQ Manual

Revenue Adjustments

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.